

An Evaluation of the CARE Program

for the

City/County Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee

by

William J. Craig

John A. Holcombe

Center for Urban and Regional Affairs

University of Minnesota

December 31, 1990

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background and Methodology	2
The Process	4
Measures of Success	7
Problems Resolved	8
New Programs	9
Neighborhood Satisfaction	10
Government Satisfaction	12
Limits of Success	13
Keys to Success	15
Prospects for the Future	17
Expansion to Other Neighborhoods	18
Maintenance in Jordan	20
Administration	22

Introduction

The CARE project is an exciting new program operating in the Jordan neighborhood in north Minneapolis. It is designed to provide a holistic response from government to problems defined by the community. In Jordan this means reducing crime and drugs in the neighborhood and increasing livability. CARE stands for Community And Resource Exchange, because the community sets the agenda and the government uses its resources to help achieve the community's goals. The problems addressed in Jordan are very focused and usually involve a single home where drugs are sold or other problems exist that cause problems for those living nearby. The government side is a coordinated activity, bringing together the many departments and agencies required to deal with a problem property. Much has been accomplished and participants on both the neighborhood and government sides are enthusiastic about CARE.

The program is still too new to be fully evaluated, but it is useful to list the five major objectives of the original proposal to see what was intended:

- Make target neighborhoods safer and more pleasant places to live and work.
- Identify significant drug-related and crime problems in target neighborhoods that demand a coordinated, inter-agency solution.
- Protect children against the effects of drug use in their families and immediate neighborhood.
- Support neighborhood efforts to improve the quality of life.
- Improve inter-agency communication and coordination.

It is safe to say that significant progress has been made on nearly every objective. Too little is known about how the CARE program has impacted families involved with drugs, prostitution, neglect, or abuse. The impact of these problems on the neighborhood children definitely has been reduced.

This document is a description of the CARE program and an evaluation through December 1990. At this point the program is only eight months old and continues to grow and change.

The successes have been encouraging and other neighborhoods would like to join in those benefits. But CARE in Jordan has been blessed with the right ingredients for success, ingredients that may not exist elsewhere. This report describes the reasons behind the successes in Jordan and cautions against moving into other neighborhoods without addressing those and other key issues.

CARE may be a new model for how government should set priorities and how agencies should work together to work on those priorities. This new perspective was suggested to us by many people we interviewed, some motivated by their personal philosophies, others by the successes in Jordan. Regardless of their motivation, the suggestion alone underscores the importance of understanding program strengths and weaknesses. This report is aimed at providing that understanding.

Background and Methodology

The CARE project grew out of the City/County Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee. It was implemented in the Jordan neighborhood in Minneapolis as a demonstration project. The findings of this report are based primarily on interviews with key participants in the project.

A special subcommittee of the City/County Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (CJCC) was asked by Hennepin County Attorney Tom Johnson to develop a program to reduce crime and drugs and to increase liveability. Mitch Rothman, Assistant Attorney for the city of Minneapolis, chaired the subcommittee. The approach proposed by the subcommittee and accepted by the CJCC would test the effectiveness and feasibility of using coordinated multi-agency interventions. A one-year demonstration program was to

be conducted in the Jordan neighborhood. Support was gathered from the highest levels and resolutions of support and pledges of cooperation were obtained from the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners, the Minneapolis City Council, the Minneapolis Public Schools, and the Jordan Area Community Council (JACC). As the program began in Jordan, Hennepin County's Office of Planning and Development submitted a successful proposal to the Minnesota Office of Drug Policy, Department of Public Safety, to help fund the demonstration.

The Jordan neighborhood of north Minneapolis was selected as a test site because of its characteristics. It is an inner city neighborhood with a 1980 population of 7,861; it has a non-white population of about 20 percent, and an average household income of less than \$16,000 per year. While Jordan has been a stable and vital neighborhood, five quantitative measures showed that drug problems were increasing and that stability was eroding. Jordan, however, retained many of its past strengths and had strong existing programs through which the neighborhood could play its role. The first meeting of the Jordan Neighborhood CARE Committee was held on April 3, 1990. Considerable skepticism and some posturing characterized initial meetings, but by summer major successes were resulting.

In October 1990, the CARE Intervention Coordinator, Bob Miller, contacted the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA), University of Minnesota, requesting an evaluation of the CARE program. CARE had been successful by many measures, and pressure was mounting to replicate the program elsewhere. He needed an external evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of CARE, along with recommendations for changes that might be required if the program were moved elsewhere. After an initial meeting with Miller, subsequent conversations were limited to requests for facts, documents, and meeting arrangements. The evaluation was conducted independent of Miller or his office. This report is the result.

The report is based mostly on observation and conversations and, to a lesser extent, written materials and reports. We attended many CARE meetings, including a neighborhood pot-luck dinner attended both by government and neighborhood CARE Committee participants and by others: *e.g.* Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee members, judges, police, probation department staff, and a city council member. We attended three block meetings and door-knocked for one. Focus group sessions were held with: the CARE Steering Committee; neighborhood participants on the CARE Committee, which included both full members and those who have been regular attendees; the government part of the CARE Committee; and block leaders who have taken their problems to the CARE Committee. Finally, we interviewed individually the Intervention Coordinator, Bob Miller, the community organizer, Jay Clark, and various members of the key groups listed above who could not attend one of the focus group meetings.

The Process

The focus of CARE in Jordan is on problem properties identified at block club meetings. A block leader brings those problems to a Jordan Neighborhood CARE meeting where they are discussed and a plan of attack is designed. Two weeks later, at the next neighborhood CARE Committee meeting, results are presented. If a problem has not been solved, its resolution is carried forward to subsequent meetings.

Block meetings are organized by the Jordan Area Community Council (JACC) and its executive director, Jay Clark. By December of 1990 about 60 percent of the blocks were "organized," up from 25 percent at the time of CARE's beginning. At an initial meeting, Jay first describes the general problems of the neighborhood and JACC's history of working on one problem at a time. An earlier effort called "Dirty Thirty" identified 30 problem properties and had success in improving half of them. Their current effort focuses on drugs, in a program called "Block Out Drugs." He describes activities that might

indicate the presence of a drug house and then asks people whether they have seen such activity at any house on their block. People are only too willing to talk. Jay helps them focus their attention on specific houses and key details; he is careful to keep them from using this forum for personal feuds. In a given session, he tries to focus on the top few problems. He distributes a form on which people can place surveillance information and asks them to bring these forms to the next meeting, usually one month later. He closes the meeting with an evaluation: what did people like about the meeting and what would they like to improve? At an organizing meeting for one block, we found people to be pessimistic about their neighborhood and skeptical that this effort would produce results. At meetings with blocks already organized, where CARE had produced positive results for those blocks, we found the skepticism replaced with a sense of hope and purpose.

JACC is responsible for making the block meetings representative. Every effort is made to ensure a good turn-out at the block meetings. Doors are knocked and fliers dropped on the evening before the meeting. Reminder calls are made on the night of the meeting. Experience has shown that people are more willing to identify specific properties if the geographic area is expanded to cover four blocks; with this large an area attendance has been as high as 75 people. JACC has helped make these meetings "inclusive" and minority homeowners have been represented at the block meetings, but not at the Jordan Neighborhood CARE Committee meetings as block representatives, causing some to worry about whether the community agenda is too white. If the system of representation has failed however, it has been with renters, both white and minority, who have less of a stake in the neighborhood.

The Jordan Neighborhood CARE Committee meets every two weeks, on Tuesday night, in the JACC office on Lowry Avenue. The committee membership consists of both government people and representatives from the neighborhood. Given the current neighborhood focus on drugs, crime, and property, the government side of the committee

contains representatives from the following city agencies: Inspections, Health, MCDA (Minneapolis Community Development Agency), Community Crime Prevention/SAFE, and Police. Recently, representatives from Hennepin County's Welfare Fraud Division and Probation Office have joined the group. The neighborhood side consists of 3 to 4 official members, representatives from those blocks where specific action is under discussion, and interested citizens. These meetings are open to anyone living in the neighborhood.

A presentation is made by the block leader to the committee, describing the nature of a problem and details from the neighborhood surveillance. While the meetings are open, problems can be presented only by block representatives. This approach focuses the meeting and adds credibility to the problem statement. The surveillance information supplied by the block adds to the credibility of the problem identification and provides the basis for developing a plan of action.

The Jordan Neighborhood CARE Committee is chaired by Bob Miller, the Intervention Coordinator from Hennepin County government. In some cases he has been notified by Jay Clark about the properties and issues identified in the block meetings and he has contacted the relevant city/county agencies to alert them so they can bring relevant information to the next CARE meeting. In many cases however, the properties have caused enough difficulty over time that they are well known by the agency representatives. Bob turns to the appropriate agency representatives, asking them to present known information about the property in question and to suggest corrective action. Sometimes action is restricted by laws and policies, such as those requiring reasonable delays in the taking of property because of non-payment of taxes. Whenever this is the case, an explanation of the restrictions and the expected time-frame is given which is greatly appreciated by the neighbors.

When action can begin, the best approach usually involves a multi-agency attack and the details of that coordinated activity are worked out on the spot. For example, a building inspector cannot enter a locked building, but could plan an inspection to follow a police raid on a problem building where the police have used a warrant to open the building. This is a key aspect of the CARE project, the integration and coordination of all relevant agencies to attack a single problem. To the extent that this happens outside the CARE project, such coordination is sporadic and very time consuming.

Two weeks later the block leader returns to learn the outcome. The neighbors remember that some early problems were pushed aside by the agencies, but the neighbors persisted and resolution was found. Whether or not this is true, agency people now feel a loyalty to the neighborhood that has led to persistence and innovative approaches to problem solving. The people from the various agencies also have developed a sense of teamwork and accountability to each other that has fueled their interest in solving problems.

Each meeting the Jordan Neighborhood CARE Committee opens with a summary of recent action, then moves to hearing a new set of problems and developing action plans. Blocks continue to meet every 6 to 8 weeks, first hearing about the results of their initial complaints, then discussing any ongoing or new problems that should be brought before CARE.

Measures of Success

By a wide variety of measures, the CARE program is a success. A number of problem properties have been cleaned up. New programs have developed to serve neighborhood needs. Both the neighborhood and the government people involved are excited by what they have been able to accomplish. However, it is still too early to determine whether the CARE program will have long-term impacts on the Jordan neighborhood.

Problems Resolved

The list of problems attacked and solved is substantial, even after only 8 months of operation. Some examples:

- 2423 Penn was a suspected drug-house. It was busy and noisy at all hours. Neighbors collected information which was passed to the city. The house was raided in October, drugs were found, and eight arrests were made.
- A dilapidated property at 1939 Hillside was demolished after a protracted period of pressing the owner to make needed structural repairs. Over the seven-month period between when the property was first brought to the Jordan Neighborhood CARE Committee's attention to when it was demolished, reports were made to the neighbors every two weeks. Many turned out to watch the demolition. Thank-you letters were sent to Tom Thorstenson of the Inspections Department. This property had been a problem for more than 10 years and was one of the properties left unresolved after JACC's Dirty Thirty campaign.
- Two properties on Irving, owned by a landlord living in Indiana, were suspected of being places to purchase drugs. Information was gathered and raids were conducted. Health and housing inspections were coordinated and occurred within 24 hours after the raid, leading to citations to the landlord. The CARE Committee pressured the landlord, who came to a meeting, to evict the problem tenants and replace them with more responsible ones. Eventually this landlord sold his properties to a local landlord who is now meeting with the CARE Committee on his plans for screening tenants and maintaining the properties.
- The Broadway and Logan area was teeming with prostitutes, johns, and drug deals. The impact on the neighborhood was significant, because of noise harassment of individuals, and threats to local children. Because it was identified by the neighborhood as a priority area, the Minneapolis Police Department worked diligently

with the committee and cleaned up the area. "Now you see mothers with strollers," we were told.

- 2324 Logan was identified as a possible drug-house. A raid failed to find any evidence on which to book the occupants, but much cash was found. Since the occupant was on welfare, a fraud investigation was initiated.
- Boarded buildings are discouraging to neighbors and give the area the appearance of deterioration. At an early CARE meeting a neighbor suggested using Plexiglass to secure buildings and the Inspections Department agreed. The neighborhood, as a result, looks better. This is important for the people who live there--or might be willing to live there.
- The house at 3115 James reeked of cats. The city Health Department could think of no way to correct this, but the neighbors persisted. An obscure nuisance law was found and used to address the problem.
- 2930 Sheridan was identified as a potential drug house at a block meeting. Surveillance information was gathered by the neighbors for the police, including a floor plan. The Hennepin County Sheriff's Department then participated with the Minneapolis Police Department in a successful raid. When the initial assault team emerged from the house, the elderly woman from next door hugged the leader in gratitude and neighbors came out to share cocoa and say thank-you. Said one police officer, "That's like getting the Heisman Trophy."

New Programs

A number of new programs are being developed to serve neighborhood needs. The residents of Jordan were responsible for some of these developments or were among the first to take advantage of others and prove their merits. These new and innovative approaches are examples of how the neighborhood and public agencies have come to trust

each other and are working on longer term solutions in addition to taking short term actions on immediate problems.

- The criminal justice system is reviewing neighborhood impact statements as it considers detention and sentencing decisions. Prostitution and drugs are often viewed as "victimless crimes" in which only willing participants are harmed. The Jordan neighborhood has been able to document the negative impact of these activities on the lives of people living adjacent to problem properties, including statements that their children have found bags of drugs while waiting for the school bus. The police and court systems have listened to these statements and are now beginning to use them as they deal with perpetrators.
- The Neighborhood Service Corps is being created out of several programs to help better maintain eyesores in Jordan, vacant lots and the yards of abandoned buildings. Local youth will be employed to help improve their own neighborhood.
- Jordan has investigated programs in other cities to see if community housing and health inspectors can be used to supplement city workers. More work is needed to see if this could work in Minneapolis or how it might be modified to fit local needs. The neighborhood is being encouraged to pursue this idea.
- The neighborhood proposed the idea of community restitution where people causing problems in the neighborhood are required, as part of their sentencing, to perform community service in Jordan. This idea is being considered by criminal justice system agencies and the courts.

Neighborhood Satisfaction

People in the neighborhood are very happy with the CARE program. It has empowered them, giving them a sense of hope and a perception of control over their lives. CARE has also improved their view of government, especially the City of Minneapolis.

The neighborhood was very skeptical of CARE in the beginning and the skepticism continues for blocks not yet involved in the process. We attended both a newly organized block meeting and meetings of blocks who had already presented problems to the Jordan Neighborhood CARE Committee. At one of the latter meetings new problems were identified and some of the "resolved" problem properties were showing early signs of renewed illegal activity. Jay asked, "How confident are you that these things will be cleaned-up?" and the answer was "completely." Then he asked, "How confident would you have felt six months ago?" and the answer was "zero."

The people living in the Jordan neighborhood have learned how to organize themselves to get attention and credit CARE for this education. They appreciate the fact the government responds to a united grass-roots voice as opposed to individual complaints or even demands by a neighborhood-based power structure--one that might have an agenda that does not represent the views of the average resident. The neighbors are proud that they have been able to get people in their neighborhood to work together. They have learned how to spot a drug-house and how to collect information that will be useful in shutting it down. All of this has led to a sense of empowerment.

People now have a different view of government, at least of the departments represented at the CARE meetings. They are happy that they have been able to educate government people about their neighborhood and the problems in it. They have enjoyed seeing bureaucrats getting excited about solving those problems. They have a better understanding, both of the options open to these agencies and of the limits placed on them. The people believe that they are helping to change the system, making government more accountable, and hope that other neighborhoods will share in this benefit.

Government Satisfaction

In many ways, the success felt by the government participants in the CARE project reflects the satisfaction felt by neighborhood residents. They too are pleased with the list of problems resolved and their new appreciation of the reality of the problems for people living in the neighborhood. They are also impressed by their new ability to work together. They too were skeptical at the beginning of the CARE project and are now enthusiastic about it. At the start most were drafted and began attending reluctantly; now the CARE meeting is a highlight of their job. Rather than the usual run of endless meetings to develop a new program, they are involved in real problem solving that supersedes theoretical program development.

For those who have been involved, there is a feeling that their colleagues back in their agencies would benefit from dealing with a neighborhood first-hand too. They feel privileged, as do the neighborhood participants, at having had a chance to be part of this effort. They have a better understanding of the problems. They have enjoyed seeing people from the neighborhood get involved. They have benefited from the identification and surveillance work done by people in the neighborhood. They had felt that residents did not appreciate certain restrictions on their responses and have gained satisfaction from being able to explain the reasons when progress is slower than everyone would have liked. In short, there is a new sense of working together with the neighborhood on an action-oriented agenda that really does improve people's lives.

Government people also have a new appreciation of the advantages of coordinating their efforts with other government agencies. This coordination has given them the ability to get results fast and this has given them satisfaction. This coordination has been possible, in the past, only through personal connections and enormous amounts of time on the telephone. The CARE process, while it appears to be more labor intensive, might

actually be a more efficient use of government workers' time. It certainly resolves problems more quickly.

Three quotes from involved government people are worth repeating. Each provides a sense of enthusiasm for the CARE project and of optimism:

- "It helps me do my job better."
- "We are actually doing something [effective] for the first time that I've seen in twenty years."
- "The CARE program may be a prototype for changing policies and procedures, making government more responsive."

Limits of Success

Despite these positive outcomes and attitudes, the CARE program cannot be declared a total success. In large part, we withhold our final judgement because it is too soon to know whether the hopes for the Jordan neighborhood will be realized. To some degree, success has been limited by the inability to involve some key players.

In the long run, people hope that Jordan will see many improved measures of stability and a higher quality of life. These measures might include lower numbers of police calls, more use of prenatal health care, higher levels of home ownership (especially by families), and higher test scores by school children. Because these indicators will take years to stabilize and improve, it is much too early to tell whether the downturn of Jordan has been reversed. In fact, for some properties, calls to police have increased because of a new faith that something will be done.

In the short run, problems do not go away simply because they have been stopped at one location at one point in time. In fact, there is evidence of problems returning to previously cleaned properties; neighbors now know the signs and are attempting to stop problems before they become large again. There is a wariness and a need for continued

vigilance. Even the most involved people continue to be concerned about their future in the neighborhood--enough that a few have their homes for sale and many see themselves living elsewhere in five years.

Initial efforts in Jordan have been aimed at eliminating problems, but more needs to be done to make positive gains. In general, the city has been the most involved, because it provides the "hard" services that attack symptoms. Hennepin County has more responsibility for "community" services, such as drug treatment, that treat the problems of individuals and families. It remains to be seen whether the neighborhood can organize to request the services that would assist people who need help and who, by getting it, would become better neighbors. At this point, CARE is aimed at dealing with the immediate problems of the Jordan neighborhood. Although there is some concern for the people causing the problems and the next neighborhoods where they might land, this is not the primary focus of the Jordan Neighborhood CARE Committee.

It has been an important part of the CARE process that problems must be identified in block meetings, but sometimes that process is violated by overenthusiastic neighbors and agency representatives. The involvement of people at the block level empowers them while leading to the identification of and solution to a particular problem. From this empowerment comes individual hope and collective neighborhood pride and stability. In a few cases, over-zealous block representatives report more problems than their meeting identified and eager-to-please agency representatives have taken action on those items. Those actions do little to foster neighborhood empowerment.

Not every group in the neighborhood is involved in CARE. In Jordan, as in many places, it is homeowners who have the largest stake in the neighborhood and who are the most involved. People who choose to rent and stay in one place for a long time seem to be a phenomena of the past. Renters are often the source of the problem and they are not

involved in any solution, certainly not in CARE. They are invited to block meetings, personally and by phone, but they have not participated.

There are other groups whose unwillingness to participate causes problems. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Veterans Administration have acquired numerous properties in Jordan as a result of loan defaults. Their goal for these properties is to get a high price and many do not sell. HUD and VA properties are among the most poorly maintained in the neighborhood and some "secured" properties have become open to children for play and places from which to sell drugs.

At the beginning of our work we heard concern that Hennepin County's might not be fully committed, but the evidence is accumulating that the county is a willing and effective participant. Bob Miller, the Intervention Coordinator, is from the county's Office of Planning and Development. Probation and Welfare Fraud have become regular members at the CARE meetings. The County Sheriff participated in a recent drug raid. The county is starting to work with the Jordan neighborhood to see whether new community services would be useful to the neighborhood in its efforts to stabilize itself. The major except to Hennepin County's participation, is the lack of involvement by Child Protection even though this office was invited. Participation and communication have been vital to the success of CARE. It would be enough if a representative regularly came to the CARE meetings to listen to problems and to explain the agency's need to maintain confidentiality.

Keys to Success

In very many ways the CARE program has been an enormous success. The reasons behind that success are due to both the structure of the program and to the people involved. If the program is to be extended or expanded, these critical aspects must be identified so that they can be maintained and replicated.

At the neighborhood end the structure emphasizes identifying priority problem properties at the block level, then collecting and presenting information to assist the government agencies in correcting the problem. It is critical that priorities are set and that the problems are specific, otherwise no specific actions could be taken. The fact that this is a community-driven agenda means that neighborhood priorities are being followed, not those of individual government agencies. Agencies could move quickly on individual complaints, but waiting for the block meeting process empowers the people willing to work together to solve a community problem.

By involving an entire block, the problems gain more credibility than they would have from individual complaints and engender a more comprehensive and timely response. Operating at this level removes doubt about representativeness that might taint a list of problems identified by the neighborhood organization itself. Initial problems were picked from which early success could be gained; this gave the neighborhood confidence that could be useful in solving more deep-rooted problems.

At the government level, the right agencies were involved to work on the types of problems identified by the neighborhood. The communication between the block organizer and the government coordinator assured this would be true for each set of problems brought in. By bringing agencies together, coordinated actions could be planned out quickly, leading to quick results. The continuity provided by the bi-weekly meetings kept the government people accountable to the neighborhood and to each other. As one agency person said, "I wouldn't want to be the one person in the group who did not follow-up on his or her promises to take action."

Bob Miller and Jay Clark have been critical to the success of CARE in Jordan. Both have enormous energy, a sense of purpose, credibility with their constituency, an understanding of how their side of the partnership operates, a tenacity to get people working towards a common goal, and good communication skills. A word needs to be

said about each separately. Bob Miller's role involves the enormous task of cutting across agencies and levels of government, and of following up with many people who have made promises. Jay Clark's role is to root through the initial bickering and unfocussed ramblings of the block meetings and help them organize a focussed agenda, to which the government agencies can respond. It is important that he is part of an independent neighborhood organization, not a government employee, as this gives him freedom and credibility. The CARE project might succeed without these two, but their replacements would need to have the same capabilities.

Finally, the contribution of committed individuals on the CARE Committee should not be underestimated. When personal problems reduced participation of some of the neighborhood CARE members, their loss was minimal because new volunteers had become regular contributing attendees. On the government side, an excellent group of people was drafted. Not every department employee is willing to give up an evening or go work in a neighborhood. Not only was this group willing, but they quickly became infected with enthusiasm. They are justly proud of their accomplishments and of the response of the neighborhood.

Prospects for the Future

CARE has been in operation for only eight months, but already its successes are raising questions about its future. Other cities and neighborhoods are asking to be next in line, to gain the same access to government resources that has benefited the Jordan neighborhood. This raises two questions: can the program be transferred to another location and, given limited resources, can the Jordan neighborhood maintain its activity with reduced attention from government agencies?

As implemented in the Jordan neighborhood, CARE had a particular focus on crime and drugs and on individual problem properties. These problems call for responses from

particular agencies and those agencies are limited in the number of locations where they could provide such intensive service. Much of what follows in this section assumes that those same problems would be primary in other areas. It is entirely possible that a different set of neighborhood issues would be identified in subsequent areas and no one agency would need to become overextended.

Expansion to Other Communities

The successes in Jordan were dependent on key factors that might not be present in other communities and neighborhoods. It is an open question whether communities without those factors would be able to attain similar success. Even if it is possible, it appears that the number of neighborhoods which could be given similar attention is limited, perhaps to as few as 4 or 5.

The relatively high percentage of long-time home owners in Jordan gave that neighborhood a solid base of people committed to saving the community and participating in the CARE process. JACC has worked hard to involve renters, but has been unsuccessful. A neighborhood with a high proportion of renters would need to be much more successful in engaging these people, who have less of a stake in the neighborhood, or risk being short on the community-effort side of the joint program that has made CARE successful. Moreover, credibility would be lost from the problem identification aspect if relatively few people were involved.

The success of the CARE program in the Jordan Neighborhood has required an energetic community organizer. We doubt whether a neighborhood without someone like Jay Clark could organize to be a capable partner with the government participants in a CARE effort elsewhere. He has organized the block meetings and helped the residents focus their discussions and efforts on problems that could be portrayed coherently at CARE meetings, where plans of action are developed.

It is clear, too, that the lead government person in the new neighborhood will need to have characteristics like those of Bob Miller. It might be best, in fact, for Miller to lead the effort in each new neighborhood. This opens the question of who will stay behind in Jordan; we will discuss this problem below.

The city participants on the CARE Committee are already thinking about how their departments might participate in additional neighborhoods. Some current participants suggested that new people should be assigned to the next neighborhood. They argue that more government employees need to be exposed to neighborhoods and neighborhood issues to gain the same benefits that they have received. Moreover, they argue that the team involved in Jordan has developed a way of responding that may not be appropriate in another neighborhood. It is appropriate that the government partner listen to the needs of a neighborhood and not be too ready with an answer.

New government participants are not always available and those that are will need supervision to ensure that they are upholding the mission of CARE. Everyone seems to agree that while it would be ideal for the CARE process to be institutionalized, a critical element is the involvement of the "right" kind of individuals. Within the Inspections Department for example, only two additional people are seen to be right for this kind of activity. As they begin their involvement they will be taught by the current representative, asked about the problems identified at each CARE meeting, and monitored to ensure that the Inspections Department is fulfilling its role.

Given the limited resources of the Inspections Department and the belief that each individual can adequately serve on only two neighborhood CARE committees and that only two other employees are available for this type of work, that department could be fully involved with only 4 or 5 neighborhoods at any one time. This same upper limit was heard several times in our discussions with other city departments. Of course, different communities and neighborhoods will have different problems and this may require a

different mix of government agencies or less redirection of existing efforts, so the actual number of active communities could go higher.

CARE might take on quite different faces in other communities. Jordan put forward drugs as a major issue, then expanded to other "livability" issues. Over time, the CARE process developed an effective way to use block meetings to address that issue. At the core of CARE is the need for an inter-agency response to a community-based agenda. The specific issues, the participating agencies, the form of citizen participation could vary from one community to another. If it is going to be successful, CARE will need to continue to be adaptable.

Maintenance in Jordan

In the long run the Jordan neighborhood cannot continue to receive the same level of support that is now provided by the CARE program and participating agencies. People in the neighborhood and in government recognize this and are already talking about how to continue the momentum that CARE has provided.

The neighborhood has learned how to organize itself to communicate more effectively with government. This lesson will not be forgotten. But this organization has been around the problems of drugs and prostitution. People worry whether their block meetings will continue to meet every 6 to 8 weeks, as they think necessary, if these problems are solved. Can block clubs retain vitality without a common "enemy?" Perhaps the answer can be found in such positive initiatives as group clean-ups, fix-ups, and painting activities.

For now, the problems of drugs and prostitution seem capable of regenerating all too quickly. To the extent that drugs and prostitution continue to be major problems in Jordan, perhaps the CARE function could be taken over by the Police Department and its SAFE program. The neighborhood has a positive view of this program and SAFE has

enough resources to serve many communities well. This approach might serve Jordan while addressing those issues, but would do little for other issues and would lose the side-benefits gained when multiple agencies work together. It should be noted that the neighborhood does not feel that the Fourth Precinct has gotten as involved as it should, at least not yet.

But whether and how Jordan might be able to move beyond these issues is an open question. It appears that the neighborhood could benefit from community services, but it is difficult to organize block clubs around such issues. JACC may have gained the credibility to speak for much of the neighborhood, but renters remain uninvolved and they may be the most needy.

One way to reduce the burden of continuing CARE in Jordan would be to reduce the frequency of meetings. The meetings could be held every three or four weeks, at least in the winter months when problems are fewer and less bothersome. We would caution against making this reduction too soon, before all blocks are organized and before the general level of problems is reduced below current levels.

CARE could continue in the Jordan without some of the key people who were instrumental in getting it started. Those people were necessary to overcome skepticism and inertia, but those obstacles have been overcome. Dedicated people will be required to replace Bob Miller, other government representatives, and key neighborhood actors as they move on to other assignments, but the new people will not need to be market the program to the agencies who have participated so far or to those who have heard of the success in Jordan. They will need knowledge and determination, but the success of CARE has led to a new responsiveness that will make the jobs of new participants more straightforward.

Administration

CARE is administered by Hennepin County's Office of Planning and Development. Since the Jordan neighborhood is in the city of Minneapolis and most of its needs require the hard services provided by the city, some have raised the question of whether administration should remain with the county. Subsequent to CARE's beginnings, the city started its Neighborhood Revitalization Program which has goals similar to those of CARE and which could benefit from following CARE's mode of operation.

We have little to offer to such a discussion, but see several reasons to justify the present arrangement. First, the county has interests in the Jordan neighborhood and is becoming an increasingly necessary and active participant. For Jordan, the CARE program needs much more than what the city provides and includes such county services as the courts, the county attorney, probation, and many other services beyond the criminal justice system. Secondly, other cities in the county, where Minneapolis cannot operate, could benefit from CARE and have requested assistance. The county would need to take the lead, because the city cannot. Perhaps, as the biggest city, Minneapolis could coordinate its own efforts, operating under a larger CARE umbrella which is administered by the encompassing county.

Whatever the decision, we see so many accomplishments and so much potential, we hope that a resolution is reached and that CARE is expanded to cover the many communities that need it.